

REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 3 and 9 have been amended. Claim 3 has been amended to avoid repetition of subject matter now in Claim 1. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 and 9-11 were rejected on the grounds of obviousness from Henderson et al. in view of Baker et al. and Teo. The Examiner acknowledged that Henderson et al. does not disclose a video camera providing a field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline, the video camera having a wide angle lens rotatable about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft to provide a field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline as is recited in Claims 1 and 9. Baker et al. was cited as disclosing hemispheric imaging and teaching the use of a single camera for picking up images throughout a hemispheric field of view, and the Examiner considered it to be obvious to replace the two camera system of Henderson et al. providing a downward field of view from one camera and a forward field of view from the other camera with the single camera of Baker et al. which was considered to be capable of providing the forward and downward field of view. Teo was cited as disclosing compositing images to provide an omniview image.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a wide angle lens with an aspect ratio rotatable 90° about a mounting axis directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline and that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft to provide

said field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline with a view domain from horizon to horizon left to right relative to the aircraft, and forward and aft relative to the aircraft." Claim 9 has similarly been amended to recite "a landscape camera lens with an aspect ratio rotatable 90° about a mounting axis directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline and that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft to provide said field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline with a view domain from horizon to horizon left to right relative to the aircraft, and forward and aft relative to the aircraft." Support for the amendments can be found at page 5, lines 1-5, and page 6, lines 4-6.

While Baker et al. discloses hemispheric imaging and the use of a single camera for picking up images throughout a hemispheric field of view, Baker et al. fails to disclose rotating a wide angle lens or landscape camera lens with an aspect ratio 90° about a mounting axis directed forwardly and downwardly of an aircraft's centerline and perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft to achieve a field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline with a view domain from horizon to horizon left to right relative to the aircraft, and forward and aft relative to the aircraft, as is claimed.

The Examiner indicated that since Henderson et al. teaches the use of a camera system mounted to the nose of an aircraft providing a landscape camera lens system that is rotatable about a mounting axis, it was considered obvious to provide the wide angle lens system of Baker et al. for the camera 2 of Henderson et al. Camera 2 of Henderson et al. is the prior art camera unit 2 shown in Fig. 2 of Henderson et al., which is not

disclosed as rotatable about a mounting axis. Further, the Examiner acknowledged that Henderson et al. does not disclose a video camera providing a field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline, the video camera having a wide angle lens rotatable about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft to provide a field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline as is recited in Claims 1 and 9. Further, the Examiner referred to Henderson et al. at column 5, lines 4-58 and column 7, lines 24-52, which merely disclose that the individual camera head units and their lens assemblies are secured by bracket assemblies that provide rotational and elevational adjustments for the camera head unit fields of view, not that the multiple camera unit 20 is rotatable about a mounting axis. Further, mounting a hemispherical lens of Baker et al. in place of the multiple camera unit 20 and rotating it would not result in the invention as claimed.

It is respectfully submitted that Henderson et al., Baker et al. and Teo do not teach, disclose or suggest the combination of a closed circuit television mounted to an aircraft comprising a video camera providing a field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline and a plurality of separate images, with the wide angle lens or landscape camera lens having an aspect ratio rotatable 90° about a mounting axis directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline and that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft to provide the field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline with a view domain from horizon to horizon left to right relative to the aircraft, and forward and aft relative to the aircraft, as is claimed.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 3 and 9-11 are novel and inventive

over Henderson et al., Baker et al. and Teo, whether taken individually or in combination, and that the rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 9-11 should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application should now be in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By: 

James W. Paul
Reg. No. 29,967

JWP/ep

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201